

TABLE 7
ACTIONS TAKEN BY LIBRARY FOR NONRETURN OF
NONFINED MATERIAL

Action	Number of Respon- dents	Percent of Respon- dents
Hold transcript, regis- tration, diploma	13	20
Revoke borrowing priv- ileges	20	31
Contact dean/depart- ment head	10	15
Clear account before leaving	3	5
Personal communica- tion	19	29
Total	65	

DISCUSSION

It is the author's opinion that many institutions formulate circulation policies based on clientele need as well as philosophical beliefs. For example, the practice of circulating bound journals varied greatly among the institutions surveyed. An explanation for this may be the effect of patron demand for materials available. A smaller unit serving fewer people could conceivably have a longer circulation period.

Circulation policies are subject to frequent change as commented on by several respondents. Such regulations are constantly under scrutiny to make sure they adequately meet faculty and student needs as well as comply with overall library policies.

The question of charging fines seems to pose many problems for librarians. There does not appear to be any clear direction in dealing with this matter. While a no-fine policy may be ideal for certain libraries, others feel they could not survive without charging fines. In all cases, the methods an institution chooses to encourage prompt return of materials are not as crucial as seeing that the materials themselves are returned.

This study clearly points out the problematic nature of circulation policies and, while no solution to the problems have resulted, many insights into the complexities of determining circulation policies have been highlighted.

Received November 9, 1979; revision accepted January 29, 1981.

Survey of Normal Work Week, Vacation Leave, and Holiday Leave in Medical School Libraries in the United States

BY BESSIE A. STEIN, *Library Director*

*Medical College of Wisconsin Libraries
Milwaukee, Wisconsin*

THE MEDICAL College of Wisconsin Libraries (MCWL) conducted a survey of medical school libraries on normal work week, vacation leave, and holiday leave to assess MCWL's policies. A brief questionnaire requesting information on professional staff was sent to 119 medical school libraries in the United States. Omitted from the mailing were new schools and some large state school satellite libraries.

The response rate was remarkably high. Completed survey forms were received from 107 (90%) of the libraries, suggesting that other librarians are interested in the same information, and that a short, simple questionnaire engenders greater response. The data collected are reported here* since they might prove useful to other librarians in negotiating improved fringe benefits.

The most frequently cited normal work week was forty hours (Table 1), although respondents were eager to point out that professional staff very often work in excess of normal hours.

Annual leave was of primary interest to the author. Results in Table 2 supported the assump-

TABLE 1
NORMAL WORK WEEK

Hours	Number of Responses
40	58 (54.21%)
38.75	1 (.94%)
38.5	1 (.94%)
37.5	25 (23.36%)
35.5	1 (.94%)
35	16 (14.95%)
No response	5 (4.67%)

*Most librarians who responded to the survey expressed a special interest in data on professional status. While the majority of respondents (71%) indicated faculty, academic, or professional/administrative status, it was not possible to identify exactly what was meant by each category. A total of eighteen different titles were identified but further clarification is required to make valid comparisons.

TABLE 2
VACATION LEAVE

Annual Earned Leave (Days)	Number of Responses
30	1 (.94%)
25	5 (4.67%)
24	21 (19.63%)
23	7 (6.54%)
22.5	1 (.94%)
22	31 (28.95%)
21	4 (3.74%)
20	18 (16.82%)
15	10 (9.35%)
13.5	1 (.94%)
12	2 (1.87%)
10.5	3 (2.80%)
10	3 (2.80%)

tion that leave benefits at MCWL do not compare favorably with those at other medical schools. Leave benefits of 20 days or more were indicated by 88 libraries (82.25%). The most common number of leave days was 22, as reported by 31 libraries (28.97%).

Since there are variations in the number of paid holidays from year to year in a few institutions because of religious holidays, state and national elections, and other variables, figures shown in Table 3 are the minimum in each case. Additional possible days varied from one to three. The one library reporting 20 paid holidays indicated 12

TABLE 3
ANNUAL PAID HOLIDAYS

Number of Days	Number of Responses
20	1 (.94%)
18	1 (.94%)
17	1 (.94%)
15	2 (1.87%)
14	3 (2.80%)
13	8 (7.48%)
12	11 (10.28%)
11	24 (22.43%)
10.5	1 (.94%)
10	17 (15.89%)
9	11 (10.28%)
8	12 (11.21%)
7	7 (6.54%)
6	4 (3.74%)
5	1 (.94%)
National Holidays + 2	1 (.94%)
No Response	2 (1.87%)

holidays, plus an additional four days both at Easter and Christmas.

Received November 18, 1980; revision accepted March 5, 1981.

The Organization of a Slide Collection in a Medical Library

BY JEANNE M. CILLIERS, *Subject Librarian*

*Medical Library
University of Pretoria
Pretoria, South Africa*

AS IS THE CASE with books and journals, efficient use of audiovisual materials necessitates a good classification or indexing system. Much has been written on this subject, in particular with regard to slide collections, because no one system has yet been devised to accommodate all their unique characteristics. This paper, another contribution toward the more efficient organization of slide collections, is the result of a search for a slide organization system which would provide for the effective retrieval of specialized medical slides without sacrificing too much in terms of indexing cost and time. The Medical Library of the University of Pretoria undertook the development of a system only after it appeared that no system suitable to its needs had been described in the literature.

SURVEY OF EXISTING SYSTEMS

In 1967 White did a survey to establish whether any standard practice existed concerning the organization of slide collections. However, the diversity in size and scope of these collections prevented such generalization [1]. Clawson and Ranowski concluded that each subject specialty has its own unique requirements for slide indexing [2].

Simons and Tansey found that book classification systems do not comply with the needs for slide classification: "Book classifications provide for the very general, for the very specific, and everything between. Classification of slides and pictures can make use only of the most specific" [3]. This emphasized the need for a separate classification scheme for collections of individual slides, as distinct from a film (which consists of a predetermined sequence of pictures which form a unit) or